

### **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 8, 2010.

#### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed June 8, 2010, Claims 1-11, 13, 15-39, 41, 43-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter in Claims 91, 94 and 96. Claims 92, 94 and 96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 29-39, 41, 43-56 and 93-94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 29, 57 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parker et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0010607 hereinafter Parker). Claims 1-11, 13, 15-16, 19-39, 41, 43-44, 47-67, 69, 71-72, 75-84 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0064733 hereinafter Gong), in view of Rice III (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174010 hereinafter Rice). Claims 9-10, 37-38 and 65-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and Rice as applied to Claims 1, 29 and 57 above, and further in view of DeBry (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,728 hereinafter DeBry). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and Rice, as applied to Claims 1, 29 and 57 above, and further in view of Jhingan et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0186851 hereinafter Jhingan).

#### **II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment**

The present Reply amends Claims 1-3, 57, 92 and 96; cancels Claims 29-39, 41, 43-56 and 93-94; and adds new Claim 97, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-11, 13, 15-28, 57-67, 69, 71-84, 91-92 and 95-97. Reconsideration of the Application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **III. Specification**

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2010, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, Claims 92, 94 and 96

had recited the limitation that objected to as not having been found in the Specification.

The present Response hereby amends Claims 92 and 96 and cancels Claim 94. In particular Claims 92 and 96, as amended recite the limitation "*wherein the proxy server, after receiving the modifications logs into the file source by using the credentials and updates the file in the original location from which the file was originally retrieved to reflect the modifications received at the proxy server.*" Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification contains the proper antecedent basis for this limitation. For example, see "the proxy server 125 can then accept 735 any changes made to the file. In one embodiment, these changes are initially stored in the file cache 425... (Specification paragraph 52). "The proxy server logs in and interacts with the file source..." (Specification paragraph 35). "The proxy server 125, using the internal credentials provided by the sharer of the file, modifies the file. In one embodiment, when the sharer of the file next logs into the proxy server, he is notified that changes have been made to the original version of the file." (Specification, paragraph 52).

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the above amendments, the Specification now provides proper antecedent basis for the limitations in Claims 92 and 96 and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2010, Claims 92, 94 and 96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been amended to comply with the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112. As described above in Section III, in light of the amendments, Claims 92 and 96 now fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2010, Claims 29-39, 41, 43-56 and 93-94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The present Response hereby cancels Claims 29-39, 41, 43-56 and 93-94, thereby rendering moot any rejection as to these claims.

**VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2010, Claims 1, 29, 57 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parker.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *A method for sharing files with remote users, the method comprising:*
  - accepting, at a proxy server, a request from a file sharer to share a file in an original file location of the file sharer with a remote user, the file located at a file source inside an internal private network of the file sharer, said private network having a firewall;*
  - obtaining, by the proxy server, a set of credentials from the file sharer, wherein the credentials are used to access the file in the original location;*
  - generating a proxy representation on the proxy server wherein the proxy representation enables remote access to modify the file in the original location inside the private network, wherein the proxy representation contains location information used by the proxy server to locate the file inside said private network; and wherein the proxy server contains the set of credentials of the file sharer that are needed to access the file on the file source;*
  - receiving a request from the remote user to access the proxy representation on the proxy server;*
  - providing, the remote user access to the proxy representation and receiving one or more modifications via the proxy representation on the proxy server from the remote user;*
  - wherein the proxy server logs into and interacts with the file source by using the set of credentials and wherein the proxy server modifies the file by using the set of credentials provided by the file sharer;*
  - wherein after the updating, when the file sharer accesses the file in the original location, changes to the proxy representation made by the remote user are reflected in the file in the original location.*

In the Office Action, it was proposed that Parker “does disclose using credentials of the original file sharer to actually update the original file as claimed in claim 1 (pars. 0034-0037; Figs. 4-5; the file manager indicates whether file accessor 198 is a viewer authorized to view the file or an editor authorized to modify the file; par. 0048; only persons granted a specific level of authorization are able to exercise that authorization; passing the file reference through a one-way cryptographic function (e.g., including a user ID, a file ID and a time ID at the input); password of passphrase is used for authentication; pars. 0081-0087; file manager can designate file accessor 198 as a viewer or editor; see also pars. 0092-0095” (Office Action page 5, citing Parker).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portions of Parker are different from the limitations defined in Claim 1, as amended. In particular, the cited portions of Parker appear to be describing the ability to designate and check the authorization status of the file accessor (i.e. the person with whom the file manager is trying to share a file). However, none of this disclosure in Parker mentions a proxy server that uses the credentials of the original file sharer to later modify the original file with the changes to the proxy that were submitted by the remote user. This use of the original file sharer's credentials is not at all mentioned in Parker. For example, the disclosures in paragraphs 92-95 appear the ability of the file manager to designate the ability of the file accessor to either modify or only view the file. However, it does not describe any server using the credentials of the file sharer to go back and update the file in its original location, as defined in Claim 1. Similarly, the other cited portions of Parker appear to describe a means to check whether the file accessor has been granted the ability to access the file by the original user. It does not actually use the credentials of the original user for any purpose, nor mention any such use, as defined in Claim 1.

The above features of Claim 1 enable the proxy server to obtain access to the secure file sources that the file sharer has access to, create a proxy for those files and then later use the file sharer's credentials to update the file based on the modifications done to the proxy. The original file sharer can then be informed, upon next log in, that the original file has been modified using his credentials. This type of functionality enables the system to remain secure while still allowing the file sharer to share access to the file.

In view of the comments above, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Parker, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim 57**

Claim 57, while independently patentable, recites limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

#### **Claims 91-92 and 95-96**

Claims 91-92 and 95-96 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that

these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 91-92 and 95-96 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

#### **Claims 57 and 93-94**

Claims 57 and 93-94 have been canceled, thereby rendering moot any rejections as to these claims.

#### **VII. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed June 8, 2010, Claims 1-11, 13, 15-16, 19-39, 41, 43-44, 47-67, 69, 71-72, 75-84 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong, in view of Rice. Claims 9-10, 37-38 and 65-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and Rice as applied to Claims 1, 29 and 57 above, and further in view of DeBry. Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong and Rice, as applied to Claims 1, 29 and 57 above, and further in view of Jhingan.

In the Office Action, it was agreed that "Gong does not explicitly disclose the proxy representation contains stored credentials of the file sharer that are needed to access the file on the file source; and using the credentials of the file sharer to update the file in the original location inside the internal private network based on the modifications to the proxy representation received at the proxy server." It was proposed, however, that Rice discloses "*the originator of a document AppLink may specify, for example, whether a remote client accessing the document may alter the document and whether a password will be required in order to access the data file being linked; checkbox 153 and password text-box 158;*" and "*remote client enters password in text box 220 to access [and/or alter] the document.*" (Office Action, pp. 17-18, citing Rice).

However, Applicant respectfully submits that these features are different from the limitations of Claim 1, as amended. In particular, Rice discloses a mechanism where a document creator can specify who can access his/her document and what access will be given. However, there is no

disclosure in Rice of a proxy server using a file sharer's (i.e. creator's) own credentials to update the original file after it has been modified by a remote user. There is no mention at all of using the file sharer's or document creator's own credentials anytime after the document has been shared. This feature was described in more detail above with respect to the rejections under the Parker reference. As evident from their disclosures, neither Parker, nor Rice disclose these specific limitations of Claim 1 and therefore do not disclose, nor render obvious this claim.

**Claims 2-11, 13, 15-16, 19-27, 57-67, 69, 71-72, 75-84, 91-92 and 95-96**

Claims 2-11, 13, 15-16, 19-27, 57-67, 69, 71-72, 75-84, 91-92 and 95-96 depend from and include all of the features of Claim 1. Claims 2-11, 13, 15-16, 19-27, 57-67, 69, 71-72, 75-84, 91-92 and 95-96 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**VIII. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed herewith is a Petition for Extension of time, together with the appropriate fee, extending the time to respond up to and including October 8, 2010.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 6, 2010

By: /Martin C. Fliesler/  
Martin C. Fliesler  
Reg. No. 25,656

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800